



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,282	07/30/2003	Richard Martin Jacobson	A01395	9705
7590 03/27/2006 Rohm and Haas Company 100 Independence Mall West Philadelphia, PA 19106			EXAMINER QAZI, SABIHA NAIM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/630,282

Applicant(s)

JACOBSON ET AL.

Examiner

Sabiha Qazi

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 5-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 5-8 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1616

Non Final Office Action on Merits

Acknowledgement is made of the response and election of group II (claims 2-4) and species 1, 2, diiodo-1-methylcyclopropane (claim 4) with traverse. Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 2-4 are examined; others are withdrawn from consideration as non-elected invention.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003)

Response to Remarks

- Applicant argues that the all the groups should be examined together. Examiner respectfully disagrees for the reasons cited in our last office action.
- However, Examiner will rejoin the method of use when the compounds Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case several claimed diseases can be treated such as for

Art Unit: 1616

example inflammation and arteriosclerosis can be treated by other compounds and compositions does not require the composition or compound as presently claimed.

- Inventions of group II and IV are related as process of making and process of using the product. The use as claimed cannot be practiced with a materially different product. Since the product is not allowable, restriction is proper between said method of making and method of using. The product claim will be examined along with the elected invention (MPEP § 806.05(i)).
 - These inventions are independent and distinct, each from the other. The reference, which would anticipate the invention of one group, would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious over the other group. The search for each of the inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Further, the consideration for patentability is different in each case. Thus it would be an undue burden to examine all the above inventions in one application.
 - In order to be eligible for rejoinder, a claim to a nonelected invention must depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim. A withdrawn claim that does not require all the limitations of an allowable claim will not be rejoined.
- Furthermore,
- where restriction was required between a product and a process of making and/or using the product, and the product invention was elected and subsequently found allowable, all claims to a nonelected process invention must depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim for the claims directed to that process invention to be

Art Unit: 1616

eligible for rejoinder. See MPEP § 821.04(b).

- Until elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claim that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103 (b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996).
- In order to retain the right to rejoinder, applicant is advised that the claims to the nonelected invention(s) should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the elected invention. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.
- Rejoined claims must be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112.

See also MPEP § 804.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 – First Paragraph Rejection

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1616

2. Claims 2-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for certain cyclopropane compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for all the cyclopropanes as claimed. See when G is an unsubstituted or substituted, unsaturated partially saturated, or saturated; monocyclic, bicyclic, tricyclic or fused; carbocyclic or heterocyclic ring system. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, 153 (CCPA 1977), have been clarified by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986), and are summarized in In re Wands (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed Cir. 1988)). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

The amount of direction or guidance presented: There is no guidance in the disclosure on how to make and use the invention successfully for different structures containing vast variety of substituents. See especially when G is an unsubstituted or substituted, unsaturated partially

Art Unit: 1616

saturated, or saturated; monocyclic, bicyclic, tricyclic or fused; carbocyclic or heterocyclic ring system.

Heterocyclic in one event for example may contain a five, or more, membered heterocyclic ring or a polycyclic heterocyclic ring, the heterocyclic or polycyclic ring may contain 1-4 hetero atom.

Total number of non hydrogen atoms is 50 or less (d, in claim 2).

In *re* Dreshfield, 110 F.2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combinations included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result."

The courts have further interpreted undue experimentation as requiring "ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art" (*Fields v. Conover*, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)) or requiring an extended period of experimentation in the absence of sufficient direction or guidance (*In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977)). Additionally, the courts have determined that "... where a statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles", a rejection for failure to teach how to make and/or use is proper (*In re Marzocchi*, 169 USPQ 367 (CCPA 1971)).

The presence or absence of working examples: There are no working examples and/or data to support the claimed invention. The disclosure does not contain any working examples to

Art Unit: 1616

support such a large group of compounds.

A disclosure should contain representative examples, which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. See *In re Riat et al.* (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; *In re Barr et al.* (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

The quantity of experimentation necessary: Since claims are broad, there are no working examples, no data, and no guidance presented in the disclosure, one skilled in the art at the time of invention would have to go through undue experimentation to make and/or use the presently claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SEYFERTH et al. (US Patent 3,265,745 and ROBINSON (US Patent 3,972,901). The reference '745 teaches 1,1 dihalocyclopropanes. See the entire documents especially lines 23-51 in column 1, examples and claims. ROBINSON teaches gem-dihalo-cyclopropanes. See lines 5-32 in column 1, examples and claims.

Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming a broader scope wherein prior art teaches a subgenus of the cyclopropanes as claimed especially the compound of claim 4. Compound of claim 4 is an isomer of prior art 1,1-dihalocyclopropane wherein claim 4 compound is 1, 2-diiodo-1-methylcycloprpane.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to prepare additional cyclopropane compounds because prior art teaches these compounds. Since prior teaches these compounds it would have been obvious to select any halo atom such as iodo at both positions. In view of the teachings of the cited reference presently claimed invention is considered obvious.

Art Unit: 1616


In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Padmanabhan, Sreeni (acting) can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sunday, March 19th, 2006


SABIHA QAZI, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER